



Design Justification Statement

211 Peel Hall Road, Wythenshawe, Manchester, M22 5HJ

Author

SKY Design & Consulting Limited

Date

July 2024

Executive Summary

SKY Design & Consulting Limited have been appointed as project agents by Mr Andy Flynn to undertake all architectural works and application management for the intended works at their property at 211 Peel Hall Road, Wythenshawe, M22 5HJ.

This document is to supplement the planning application and provide support and justification to the proposed development in conjunction with local council policies.

All design justification points will be provided in blue following each policy point.

Residential Extensions Local Authority Policies

DC1.1 In determining planning applications for extensions to residential properties, the Council will have regard to:

a. the general character of the property;

the character of the property will be retained and overall building styles and materials reflect the existing.

b. the effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers;

The adjoined neighbour (No. 209) will not be impacted by the proposal. 213 Peel Hall Road has already been extended on to the boundary line at single storey. There will be a minimum of 1.3m gap between the properties at the front, increasing to achieve almost 2.1m to the rear.

c. the desirability of enabling people to adapt their houses in appropriate ways to meet changing household needs;

As mentioned, No. 213 have already extended their property to meet their needs. Further, the gap between the properties will allow for any adaption that they may wish to add at first floor in the future without causing a terracing effect.

d. the overall appearance of the proposal in the street-scene;

Various properties along Peel Hall Road have been extended to the side in varying styles, most of which have not been designed with any integrity. The proposals within this application have been considered to ensure that there will be no detrimental impact upon the street scene or surroundings.

e. the effect of the loss of any on-site carparking.

Car parking allocations will remain as existing, comprising 1No garage space and 3No car spaces to the front of the property.

DC1.2 Extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan and the following criteria:

a. they are not excessively large or bulky (for example, resulting in structures which are not subservient to original houses or project out too far in front of the original buildings);

The extension works will sit subserviently within the context of the existing dwelling. The extension is sat back from the forward front elevation and the ridge is sat lower than the existing.

b. they do not create an undue loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy;

Due to the site orientation, the sun rises over the rear garden and sets over the front driveway. As such, there is no impact whatsoever to passages of light or shadowing on to neighbouring properties.

c. they are not out of character with the style of development in the area or the surrounding street scene by virtue of design, use of materials or constructional details;

All extension styles and materials will match the existing property and surrounding area.

d. they would not result in the loss of off-street car-parking, in a situation where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created.

As mentioned in an earlier point, all car parking will remain the same, with ample parking provisions.

DC1.3 Notwithstanding the generality of the above policies, the Council will not normally approve:

a. rearward extensions greater than 3.65m (12 ft) in length;

The extension to the rear does project further than the recommended 3.65m, however the location of this element is such that no neighbouring property is impacted and sightlines from adjacent habitable rooms are not compromised.

b. 2-storey extensions with a flat roof, particularly those which would be visible from the public highway;

The roof has been designed to ensure that the dominant hipped style reflects the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

c. 2-storey extensions to terraced properties which occupy the full width of the house;

N/A

d. flat roofed extensions to bungalows; e. extensions which conflict with the Council's guidelines on privacy distances (which are published as supplementary guidance).

N/A

DC1.4 In considering proposals for 2-storey side extensions, the Council will have regard to the general guidance above and also to supplementary guidance to be issued. In particular, the Council will seek to ensure that:

a. the development potential of the gap between detached and semi-detached houses is capable of being shared equally by the owners or occupiers of the two properties concerned;

The minimum gap at the front corner of the property will be 1.3m, increasing to almost 2.1m at the rear due to the tapering of the boundary line. The adjacent property that shares this boundary line has already been extended all the way up to the boundary, therefore removing their external access between the properties.

b. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a terracing effect, where this would be unsympathetic to the character of the street as a whole;

As highlighted, the minimum gap between the properties is ample (1.3m) and the stepped arrangement of the extension ensures that there isn't a continual terraced effect.

c. the actual or potential result of building the extension will not be the creation of a very narrow gap between the properties, or any other unsatisfactory visual relationships between elements of the buildings involved. As a guide, and without prejudice to the generality of this policy, the Council will normally permit 2-storey house extensions which, when built, would leave a minimum of 1.52m (5 ft) between the side wall and the common boundary, and which meet the other requirements of this

Design Justification Statement

211 Peel Hall Road, Wythenshawe, M22 5HJ

policy. Proposals which cannot meet these requirements will be judged on their merits, but with weight being given to (a) and (c) above.

The aforementioned 1.3m gap provided is at ground floor. The gap between the properties at first floor then increases to 3.8m above the single storey extension of No. 213.

DC1.5 The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.

N/A

DC1.6 For the avoidance of doubt, policies DC1.1 to DC1.4 apply to domestic houses, flats, houses in multiple occupation, nursing homes, rest homes and hotels.

N/A

Surrounding Properties, Past Extensions & Precedents Set

No. 213 Peel Hall Road



Google street scene image to provide clarity of application site (left) and substantial side extension to No. 213 Peel Hall Road (right)

Design Justification Statement

211 Peel Hall Road, Wythenshawe, M22 5HJ

No. 174 Peel Hall Road



Google street scene image of No. 174 Peel Hall Road (directly opposite application site) with a near identical side extension.



Google 3D image of front of No. 174 detailing extension and providing context of scale and massing.



Google 3D image of rear of No. 174 detailing extension and providing context of scale. The 2-storey rear extension element is in fact wider than the submitted scheme within this application. Note, application site is opposite with blue van on driveway.

No's. 164-162 Peel Hall Road



Google street scene image of 2-storey extensions to neighbouring properties (No. 164 to left and No. 162 to right) that have greater impact on the surrounding area than the application scheme due to:

- both extensions run flush with existing front elevation and not stepped back;
- as such, the roof is dominant without a subservient ridgeline;
- the flat roof over No. 162 extension is out of keeping with the surrounding area
- there is a greater terracing effect with the 2 No 2-storey extensions sitting adjacent to each other.

The proposed extension within this application does not cause any of the above impacting points.

No's. 192-190 Peel Hall Road



Google street scene image of 2-storey extensions to neighbouring properties (No. 192 to left and No. 190 to right). Both extensions have been built along the existing front elevation line and do not sit subserviently compared with the proposed scheme within this application.

Conclusions

Considering all above points, it is proposed that the submitted scheme should be supported and granted planning permission because:

1. Precedent has been set in the immediate vicinity and wider area for 2-storey side and rear extensions of similar proportions/massing. This application would suffer prejudice if it is not considered and supported on this basis.
2. The proposed extension works are set back from the forward fronting elevation.
3. The ridgeline of the proposed extension is set lower and subservient to the original.
4. The gap between the proposed extension and adjacent property (No. 213) ranges from 1.3m at ground floor to 3.8m at first floor level, therefore negating any potential for terracing effect.
5. All proposed materials and building styles are reflective of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.
6. All Local Authority policies are adhered to with justification of the design provided to each point as referenced earlier in this statement.